UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

	United States of America	ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL
	V. Martin Silva-Ramos Defendant	Case No. 1:19-cr-00047-JTN
	after conducting a detention hearing under the Bail Reference of t	eform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), I conclude that these facts require
and and a		indings of Fact
(1)	The defendant is charged with an offense described	in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has previously been convicted of that would have been a federal offense if federal jurisdiction had
		3156(a)(4), or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for
	an offense for which the maximum sentence i	s death or life imprisonment.
	an offense for which a maximum prison term	
	U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable sta any felony that is not a crime of violence but in a minor victim the possession or use of a firearn	nvolves: n or destructive device or any other dangerous weapon
(0)	a failure to register under 18 U.S.	-
(2)	or local offense.	while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state
(3)	A period of less than 5 years has elapsed since the offense described in finding (1).	date of conviction defendant's release from prison for the
(4)	Findings (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presuperson or the community. I further find that defende	imption that no condition will reasonably assure the safety of another nt has not rebutted that presumption.
	Alternati	ve Findings (A)
(1)	There is probable cause to believe that the defenda	nt has committed an offense
	for which a maximum prison term of ten years Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).	
(2)		ablished by finding (1) that no condition or combination of conditions and the safety of the community.
		ve Findings (B)
` `	There is a serious risk that the defendant will not ap	
(2)	There is a serious risk that the defendant will endan	
		f the Reasons for Detention
evidence 1. Defer 2. Defer	a preponderance of the evidence that: ndant waived his detention hearing, electing not to condant is subject to an ICE detainer and would not be	
	Part III – Directio	ns Regarding Detention
correction	ns facility separate, to the extent practicable, from per	rney General or a designated representative for confinement in a sons awaiting or serving sentences or held in custody pending unity to consult privately with defense counsel. On order of United

Date: March 1, 2019

Judge's Signature: _/s/ Ellen S. Carmody

Name and Title: Ellen S. Carmody, U.S. Magistrate Judge

States Court or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the

defendant to the United States marshal for a court appearance.